



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,046	01/25/2002	Katsumi Kanasaki	RCOH-1044	3429

7590 02/22/2006  
KNOBLE & YOSHIDA, LLC  
Suite 1350  
Eight Penn Center  
1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER
----------

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/057,046

Applicant(s)

KANASAKI, KATSUMI

Examiner

Ranodhi Serrao

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 23 December 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. The applicant argued that, "no address is automatically generated according to a predetermined rule." In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., address is automatically generated) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).
3. The applicant argued that Krishnaswamy et al. does not teach new address definition being generated. In col. 108, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches a new user profile method being created. This serves the function of a new address definition being generated. In col. 183, a list is defined based on the type of list being created. The defined list serves the function of a rule definition. In accordance with the claim language presented, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches the claimed invention. The examiner also points out that the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification" [*In re Prater*, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969)] and "consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach" [*In re Cortright*, 49 USPQ2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1999)].

4. In conclusion, upon taking the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims, the cited reference teaches all of the claimed limitations and the rejections are reaffirmed. See below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krishnaswamy et al (5,999,525).

7. As per claims 1 and 21, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches a method and a computer readable medium storing computer executable instructions of flexibly managing addresses for a communication system (column 23, lines 23-36), comprising the steps of: requesting an address definition from a second device to a first device (column 74, lines 24-37); returning the address definition to the second device from the first device (column 108, lines 21-33); obtaining a corresponding rule definition for the address definition (column 183, lines 28-37); generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding rule definition at the second device (column 183, lines 52-60); and returning the newly generated address definition from the second address to the first device (column 184, lines 1-10).

8. As per claim 12, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches a system for flexibly managing addresses for a communication system, comprising: a third device sending a request for an address definition for use with a predetermined operation (col. 184, lines 11-18);

Art Unit: 2141

a second device connected to said third device for receiving the request for the address definition and sending the request for the address definition (col. 184, lines 19-24); and a first device connected to said second device for returning the address definition to said second device in response to the address definition request (col. 257, lines 26-52), said first device further including a address maintenance unit for maintaining address information (col. 184, lines 1-10); wherein said second device obtaining a corresponding rule definition for the address definition (col. 183, lines 28-37) and generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding rule definition (col. 184, lines 1-10), said second device returning the newly generated address definition to said third device (col. 183, lines 4-26).

9. As per claims 3 and 14, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches wherein the first or second device is an existing user account management unit for user account information (column 23, lines 37-47).

10. As per claims 4 and 15, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches an address maintenance unit that corresponds to the existing user account management unit for managing address information (column 23, lines 37-47).

11. As per claim 10, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches wherein said generating the new address definition is performed prior to said requesting the address definition (column 108, lines 21-32).

12. As per claims 11 and 20, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches wherein the address definition each has a unique ID and further comprises additional steps of determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does

Art Unit: 2141

not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists (column 102, lines 50-67).

13. As per claim 22, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches instructions comprising the steps of: requesting an address definition from a second device to a first device (column 74, lines 24-37); returning the address definition to the second device from the first device (column 108, lines 21-33); obtaining a corresponding rule definition for the address definition (column 183, lines 28-37); generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding rule definition at the second device (column 183, lines 52-60); and returning the newly generated address definition from the second address to the first device (column 184, lines 1-10), the address definition each has a unique ID; determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists (column 102, lines 50-67).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

15. Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Taylor et al. (5,754,306). Krishnaswamy et al. teaches the limitations of claims 1 and 12 as described above but fails to teach wherein the addresses include e-mail addresses, document folders, telephone number and fax numbers. However, Taylor et al. teaches

Art Unit: 2141

wherein the addresses include e-mail addresses, document folders, telephone number and fax numbers (see Taylor et al., column 10, lines 28-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the addresses include e-mail addresses, document folders, telephone number and fax numbers in order to optimize user efficiency in electronic communications.

16. Claims 5-9 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. as applied to claims 1, 4, 12, 14, and 15 above, and further in view of Ouchi (5,978,836).

17. As per claims 5 and 16, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches the limitations of claims 1, 4, 12, 14, and 15 as described above but fails to teach wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by adding a new delivery method. Ouchi however teaches wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by adding a new delivery method (column 12, lines 46-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by adding a new delivery method in order to go off route and capture the optimal route of transmission.

18. As per claim 6, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches the limitations of claims 1, 4, and 5 as described above but fails to teach wherein the new delivery method is specified in the rule definition. Ouchi however teaches wherein the new delivery method is specified

Art Unit: 2141

in the rule definition (column 8, lines 13-31). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the new delivery method is specified in the rule definition in order to insure that the value for the active document is unique.

19. As per claims 7 and 18, Ouchi and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, and 16 as described above but Ouchi fails to teach wherein the rule definition further includes or the address maintenance unit additionally manages an ID value, a Source value, a Condition value, a Name Generation Method value, and a Type Generation Method value. Krishnaswamy et al., however teaches wherein the rule definition further includes or the address maintenance unit additionally manages an ID value, a Source value, a Condition value, a Name Generation Method value, and a Type Generation Method value (column 99, line 58-column 101, line 16: wherein VNET numbers serve the function of a Condition value, unique ID serves the function of an ID value, IP address serves the function of a Source value, a Name Generation Method value, and a Type Generation Method value). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the rule definition further includes or the address maintenance unit additionally manages an ID value, a Source value, a Condition value, a Name Generation Method value, and a Type Generation Method value in order to allow an user to register his/her computer as "on-line" and available to receive calls.

20. As per claims 8 and 17, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches the limitations of claims 1, 4, 12, 14, and 15 as described above but fails to teach wherein the address



Art Unit: 2141

maintenance unit manages delivery methods by deleting an existing delivery method.

Ouchi however teaches wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by deleting an existing delivery method (column 6, line 48-column 7, line 7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by deleting an existing delivery method in order to permit more than one concurrent use of a workflow route.

21. As per claims 9 and 19, Ouchi and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of claims 1, 4, 12, 14, and 15 as described above but Ouchi fails to teach wherein the address maintenance unit updates the address information based upon the user account information. Krishnaswamy et al. however teaches wherein the address maintenance unit updates the address information based upon the user account information (column 41, lines 27-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the address maintenance unit updates the address information based upon the user account information because cache copies must be refreshed when the version is out of date.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharja can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
RUPAL DHARIA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER